

Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Remarks were made by several members of the Association on the interesting showing of this paper.

Prof. Worman, of Vanderbilt University, called the attention of the Convention to some striking facts in the development of educational interests throughout the South, speaking particularly of the writer's extensive experience in the different departments of the modern language work and of the great value of the data collected by him. In just that field where no statistics had been presented, the English, the author was probably able to judge better than any one else of the important drift of southern education.

The President of the Association being obliged to leave the Convention at this stage of the proceedings, Prof. Boyesen, on motion of the Secretary, was called to the Chair for the rest of of this meeting and for the following evening session. Prof. Elliott then read a short historical review, of

11. "The growth of the Modern Language Question in Great Britain and America during the last half a Century."

The discussion in its current aspect received its first impetus more than half a century ago when George Combe delivered a course of three lectures on "Popular Education" (1833), before the Edinburgh Philosophical Association.

In the first of this series, he combats the required study of Greek on very much the same grounds that President Eliot set forth in his address at the Eighth Anniversary of the Johns Hopkins University on the twenty-second of February, 1884; that is, the difference in the requirements of what shall constitute a liberal education to-day as compared with those that obtained in the XVI century, when Latin and Greek formed the chief staple of knowledge. The clear and well defined views brought out in these lectures soon gained so much favor that we see them pass through three editions within a decade and a half after they were delivered, and the author, in 1848, expresses himself with reference to the increased demand for them in the following manner: "I have been forcibly struck with the rapid progress made by the public mind since 1833, towards forming a just estimate, not only of the importance of education, but of its principles, objects, and practical development."

We must note just here in the beginning that this first attack upon the traditional creed of exclusive classicism was made in behalf of the Sciences (*not* of Modern Languages), and that it has been kept up on this line with varying fortune, but increasing bitterness, for the last

fifty years. Again, another important feature of the discussion must be observed in the fact that it was for more than forty years almost entirely confined to English soil, that is to say, from 1833–1879 we find only two important names connected with it on this side of the Atlantic, to wit, that of Dr. Jacob Bigelow who read a paper, in 1866, before the American Academy of Arts and Sciences, entitled: "On Classical and Utilitarian Studies;" the second is that of one of the staunchest and boldest defenders to-day of the high claims of Science to superiority over linguistic training in any system of education, I mean Mr. E. L. Youmans, who, in 1867 (eleven years after Dr. Bigelow's Essay), published his "Culture demanded by modern life." In this work, however, the author's friends Tyndall, Huxley, and others, supplied arguments in favor of scientific studies so that we cannot, therefore, count the treatise as a *specific* American production in the interests of the New Departure.

In these forty years where only two representatives appear in America, no less than a dozen advocates of the new faith wage battle in England against the old school, and among their productions we mark especially those of Alexander Bain, Herbert Spencer, Viscount Sherbrooke (Robt. Lowe), and Huxley who touch in succession upon the problems, practical and philosophical, of general education; the claims of School and University and the demands of modern life, with a trenchant significance that every thinking man must stop to consider, if he be not blinded by personal prejudice or hampered by some iron-clad dogma. But the spread of these unorthodox notions must have been more gradual in the beginning than we would naturally suppose from Combe's rejoicing over the third edition of his Lectures. The fact is, for twenty years after this celebrated writer appeared before the public, we do not find that any one took up the cudjels against the traditional routine until Hodgson came out in the latter part of 1853 with his critical examination of the arguments in favor of the Classical studies in an essay bearing the title: "The School claims of language." Then there is another break in the line of contributions for nearly ten years, before Spencer's "Education" gave us his extreme utilitarian views of the subject, and so fairly set the ball rolling that its impetus has only increased as we come down toward the present time. Between Combe's little volume and that of Spencer, almost thirty (28) years had elapsed with only one intervening contribution to the advancement of the modern cause. But the Spencer treatise marks a turning point in the growth of the history of this subject. It appeared in 1861, another followed in '65, and nearly every year thereafter witnessed a fresh addition, until 1879 brought a series of duplicate contributions that have developed within the last three years to manifold annual products. In truth, it is difficult just now to keep run of all the monographs, papers, casual contributions, etc., that see the light in our own language alone, much less in German and French, where

the question, though an equally burning one, has assumed different aspects from those present with us, and is, consequently, discussed from other but equally important points of view.

While Combe was striving to stir up public sentiment in England in favor of Science, Classical Culture began to show zealous supporters of its superior claims, but, strange to say, though the first stone was thrown in their defence on English soil, the United States must claim priority of honor in pushing the favorite studies.

If we glance through the list of defenders of the Classical Cause we shall see, contrary I think to what we should have expected, that the tables are turned on this side of the Atlantic as compared with England, that is, *we* have furnished by far the majority of advocates in their behalf, and the discussion has assumed an earnestness and pointedness with us which is scarcely known to it in the land of its birth.

In 1835 James Pillans, Professor of Humanity in the University of Edinburgh, following the example of his opponent Combe, delivered in that Institution a course of "Three Lectures on the Proper Objects and Methods of Education in reference to the different orders of society: and on the relative utility of Classical Instruction."

The following year Sir Wm. Hamilton noticed at length these lectures in the Edinburgh Review and there pointed out their special merits, their timeliness as to the condition of Classical culture in Scotland, which he regards as deplorable at that time. But to show how little he seized the real point at issue, the depth and breadth of the problem which had begun to seriously move the minds of thinkers in his native country, one sentence will suffice; "The only melancholy manifestation," he says, "In the opposition now raised to the established course of Classical instruction, is not the fact of such opposition; but that arguments in themselves so futile-arguments which, in other countries would have been treated only with neglect, should in Scotland not have been wholly harmless."

Pillans, too, has brought a sorry grist to the mill and in many cases evinces a downright lack of *Sprachgefuhl*, as when he asserts that "our mother tongue," compared with Latin and Greek," "is so entwined and identified with our early and ordinary habits of thinking and speaking, it forms so much a part of ourselves from the nursery upwards, that it is extremely difficult to place it, so to speak, at a sufficient distance for the mind's eye to discern its nature or to judge of its proportions."

About the same time that Hamilton's review appeared (1836) a series of Papers was published under the general title: "The Oxford English prize Essays," in some of which the Classical question was touched upon. This same year, however, witnessed the curious phenomenon hinted at above, namely, the transference of the burden of discussion in behalf of the Classics from England to America.

While in the former country the number of Scientists who seconded the Reform movement, rapidly increased for the forty years that followed the inception of the struggle, and the opposition stood still with the three or four original names that entered it, in the latter (America), on the contrary, the fight waxed hot from the start with Professor, and afterwards President Felton of Harvard, as leader, who for almost twenty years lost no opportunity to battle with energy and enthusiasm for the prerogatives of traditional and vested interests. About this champion the zealous professors of the true faith grouped themselves in formidable array, and have managed to successfully hold the field until within the past three years. The names of Drs. Sears and Taylor, Profs. Edwards, Bowen and Diman need only be mentioned to show what an assemblage of strong forces has been brought to bear upon this side of the problem that is now so severely vexing the educators of this country.

On the old battle-field, Dr. Arnold and John Stuart Mill were almost the only heroes, who for thirty years fought the good fight. But I do not by any means think that the want during this period of co-workers for Classical interests is due to a lack in itself of sympathisers and strong partisans of the cause, but because English Classicists imagined themselves strong enough to resist the influence of the new school without effort and, hence, for the most part, have not only been ignorant of but purposely and conscientiously ignored (until recently) the subject, as one beneath the dignity of their position.

In the latest and most radical phase of the discussion, Spencer, Huxley, and many minor lights on the other side of the Atlantic have pushed to extremes in some cases the merits of science, urging the value of the more extended experience of the present generation over those of two and three centuries ago, the more pressing needs, the wider avenues for culture, the necessity of a closer differentiation of individual tastes and adaptabilities, while their friends in America, headed by Charles Francis Adams, Jr., have struggled to force the issue upon the public by insisting upon another most important factor in modern education, namely, the disciplinary power of the Modern Languages. This element had not been entirely overlooked in the discussion preceding the date of the Harvard Discourse as we shall see a little further on, but, with this address, what had remained in the background and claimed only indirect support from most modernists, was vigorously pressed into the foreground of the lively contest and the cry for its claims was so cordially responded to that we may predict for the future, I think, a very material change if not a complete reversing of the order in which the young candidates, Science and Modern Languages, for admission into the sacred precincts of liberal studies, will be regarded in their relation to the Classical tongues.

Here President Gilman and President Eliot have given us valuable

suggestions for the modification and bettering of our present system in the United States.

In England, the result of this long and unremitting discussion was seen in the proposal last year (1883), to establish a "Mediaeval and Modern Language Tripos" at Cambridge, which was thrown out by a majority of only one in a full meeting of the Senate, and in the appointment in the summer of *this* year (1884), of a lecturer for both French and German respectively.

But while Scientists have been busy in the last ten years pressing the claims of their subject for equal consideration with the Classics, and demanding in some cases that the latter should be abolished altogether, the Professors of Modern Languages throughout the country have not been idle, though there has not been that activity on their part which this important question has deserved. As far back as 1872, Prof. G. F. Comfort, of the University of Syracuse, published in "Scribner's Monthly" an earnest appeal for a rational study of the Modern Languages under the title: "Should the study of the Modern Languages precede that of the Ancient Languages?" and insisted upon their being placed on an equal footing with the Classics. He was followed in 1876 by Prof. Edw. S. Joynes, of South Carolina College, who read before the Department of Higher Education of the National Educational Association, then assembled in Baltimore, a valuable Paper on the "Position of Modern Languages in the Higher Education" (published as separate pamphlet; also in "Home and School" for September 1876). These essays were the forerunners to a series of monographs and magazine articles among which we find important suggestions by two members of the Executive Committee of this Association, Profs. Boyesen and Williams, who in Editorials of "The Century," "The Critic," before the Mass. Teachers Association and in the "Providence Journal" have done good work for thorough reform of this branch of instruction.

All of these contributions bore so directly upon the various phases of Modern Language study in America that their natural culmination reached us in the pointed and radical address of Chas. Francis Adams in June, 1883. Up to this time the tone of the discussion had been rather conservative; with this address a new era was introduced and a fresh impulse given to the movement that had before been slowly but surely gaining ground. Public opinion seemed ripe for opening up the subject under new conditions, and the consequence was an enthusiasm for it that surprised even its most earnest supporters.

The meeting concluded with a communication by Dr. P. Carus, of New York city, on

12. "The Importance of the German Language with special reference to the Study of English."